

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|
| STANLEY A. SLUPKOWSKI | : | |
| Plaintiff | : | |
| v | : | Civil Action No. PJM-07-79 |
| THE UNITED STATES INSPECTOR | : | |
| GENERAL and | : | |
| UNITED STATES HOUSE OF | : | |
| REPRESENTATIVES WASHINGTON D.C. | : | |
| Defendants | : | |
| | o0o | |

MEMORANDUM

The above-captioned civil rights action was filed on January 10, 2007. Plaintiff alleges that there is a conspiracy between the police and the church to dismantle the United States military. Paper No. 1. As relief he requests “the inspector general House of Representatives of the United States Congress to appear and accept the seven Armed Forces Senate Sub-Committees and present them to the United States Congress for appropriate action.” *Id.* Although he has failed to pay the full filing fee or submit indigency affidavit, Plaintiff shall be granted leave to file in forma pauperis.

This Court is obliged by 28 U.S.C. §1915A to screen pro se actions and dismiss any complaint that is frivolous, malicious or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. In deciding whether a complaint is frivolous “[t]he district court need not look beyond the complaint's allegations It must, however, hold the pro se complaint to less stringent standards than pleadings drafted by attorneys and must read the complaint liberally.” *White v. White*, 886 F.2d 721, 722-723 (4th Cir. 1989).

A complaint that is totally implausible or frivolous, such as this, may be dismissed *sua sponte* for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (b)(1). *See Apple v.*

Glenn, 183 F.3d 477 (6th Cir. 1999). Notwithstanding the improbability that any of Plaintiff's claims have a basis in fact, his complaint fails to show that he has been directly harmed by the alleged conspiracy.

Plaintiff is reminded that under 28 U.S.C. §1915(g) he will not be granted *in forma pauperis* status if he has “on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.” The instant case will be the first filed by Plaintiff in this District that has been dismissed as frivolous. For the reasons stated, this case will be dismissed by separate order.

Date: 1/17/07

/s/
PETER J. MESSITTE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE